

Serial No.: 10/017,653

Filing Date: 12/12/2001

Attorney Docket No. 100.407US02

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR ELECTRONICALLY IDENTIFYING CONNECTIONS OF A CROSS-CONNECT SYSTEM

---

**REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed on May 5, 2008 has been reviewed. Claim 14 has been amended. Claims 14-45 are pending in this application.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 14-45 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,821,510) in view of Kanno (U.S. Patent No. 5,929,425).

In order to expedite prosecution, claim 14 of the present application has been amended to recite “a second communication medium communicatively coupling cross-connected termination elements of the plurality of termination elements that is separate from the first communication medium such that the user information signals are communicated only over the first communication medium, the second communication medium communicating connection information signals”.

Applicant submits that none of the cited references teach or suggest this language of claim 14. The Office Action took the position that the alleged “wireless medium connecting a hand-held optical scanner and a receiver interface 16” of Cohen is the second communication medium recited in claim 14 of the present application. However, this wireless communication medium does not “communicatively coupl[e] cross-connected termination elements of the plurality of termination elements” as now recited in amended claim 14; instead, the wireless communication medium couples the hand-held optical scanner and the receiver interface 16, which are not “cross-connected termination elements”.

Claim 15 of the present application depends from claim 14. Therefore, at least the same argument set forth above with respect to claim 14 apply to claim 15 as well.

Claim 16 of the present applications ultimately depends from claim 14.

Therefore, at least the same argument set forth above with respect to claim 14 apply to claim 16 as well.

Claim 17 of the present applications ultimately depends from claim 14.

Therefore, at least the same argument set forth above with respect to claim 14 apply to claim 17 as well.

Moreover, claim 17 further recites “at least one patch cord, the at least one patch cord comprising a first communication pathway and a second communication pathway, the first communication pathway providing communication of user information signals between a first termination element and a second termination element, and the second communication pathway providing communication of connection information signals to and from the first and second termination elements.” The Office Action took the position that the underlined language from claim 17 is taught in Cohen by “optically encoded data 13” and at column 5, lines 45-65. However, the optically encoded data 13 to which the Office Action refers is not communicated “to and from the first and second termination elements” and instead is only read by the scanner 14.

Claims 18 and 19 both depend from claims 14 and 17. Therefore, at least the same arguments set forth above with respect to claims 14 and 17 apply to claims 18 and 19 as well.

Claims 20-21 and 23-32 all ultimately depend from claim 14. Therefore, at least the same arguments set forth above with respect to claim 14 apply to these claims as well.

Claims 22 ultimately depends from claim 14. Therefore, at least the same arguments set forth above with respect to claim 14 apply to claim 22 as well.

Moreover, claim 22 further recites “wherein the processor is coupled to memory and a user interface, the user interface cooperating with one or both of the processor and memory to control at least one annunciator of selected ones of the plurality of termination elements.” The Office Action took official notice that “using a light emitting annunciator with a scanner for testing or monitoring known in the art.” The Office Action then concluded “Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art to incorporate an annunciator into each receptacle of Cohen to monitor connection status of the cross-connected receptacles.”

Applicant respectfully traverses the taking of Official Notice that “using a light emitting annunciator with a scanner for testing or monitoring known in the art”. There is no explanation contained in the Office Action as to why or how a scanner would be used with a “light emitting annunciator”. Furthermore, the Office Action fails to explain how the actual claim language recited in claim 22 is taught or suggested – the Office Action makes general assertions about the use of a light emitting annunciator with a scanner for “monitoring connection status” but does not explain how the actual claim language of claim 22 is taught or suggested (see italicized claim language set forth above).

Independent claim 33 recites, in part, “communicating, via a second communication medium separate from the first communication medium, connection information signals between the cross-connected termination elements of the cross-connect system, such that the user information signals are communicated only over the first communication medium”.

Applicant submits that none of the cited references teach or suggest this language of claim 33. The Office Action took the position that the alleged “wireless medium connecting a hand-held optical scanner and a receiver interface 16” of Cohen is the second communication medium recited in claim 33 of the present application. However, this wireless communication medium is not used to communicate “via a second

communication medium separate from the first communication medium, connection information signals between the cross-connected termination elements of the cross-connect system”; instead, the wireless communication medium couples the hand-held optical scanner and the receiver interface 16, which are not “cross-connected termination elements”.

Claim 34 of the present application depends from claim 33. Therefore, at least the same argument set forth above with respect to claim 33 apply to claim 34 as well.

Claim 35 of the present applications ultimately depends from claim 33. Therefore, at least the same argument set forth above with respect to claim 33 apply to claim 35 as well.

Claim 36 of the present applications ultimately depends from claim 33. Therefore, at least the same argument set forth above with respect to claim 33 apply to claim 36 as well.

Moreover, claim 36 further recites “communicating user information signals between a first termination element and a second termination element via a first patch pathway, and communicating connection information signals to the first and second termination elements via a second patch pathway.” Apparently, the Office Action took the position that this language from claim 36 is taught in Cohen by “optically encoded data 13” and at column 5, lines 45-65. However, the optically encoded data 13 to which the Office Action refers is not communicated “to the first and second termination elements via a second patch pathway” and instead is only read by the scanner 14.

Claims 37 and 38 both depend from claims 33 and 36. Therefore, at least the same arguments set forth above with respect to claims 33 and 36 apply to claims 37 and 38 as well.

Claims 39-42 all ultimately depend from claim 33. Therefore, at least the same arguments set forth above with respect to claim 33 apply to these claims as well.

Claim 43 of the present applications ultimately depends from claim 33. Therefore, at least the same argument set forth above with respect to claim 33 apply to claim 43 as well. Moreover, claim 43 further recites “controlling at least one annunciator of selected ones of the termination elements.” It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action fails to explain how the cited references teach or suggest this aspect of claim 43.

Claim 44 of the present applications ultimately depends from claim 33. Therefore, at least the same argument set forth above with respect to claim 33 apply to claim 44 as well. Moreover, claim 44 further recites “controlling one or more light emitting annunciators of selected ones of the termination elements for guiding a technician when configuring the cross-connect system.” It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action fails to explain how the cited references teach or suggest this aspect of claim 44.

Claim 45 of the present applications ultimately depends from claim 33. Therefore, at least the same argument set forth above with respect to claim 33 apply to claim 45 as well. Moreover, claim 45 further recites “controlling one or more annunciators of selected ones of the termination elements in response to execution of a pre-programmed sequence of patch operations to be performed by a technician.” It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action fails to explain how the cited references teach or suggest this aspect of claim 45.

Serial No.: 10/017,653

Filing Date: 12/12/2001

Attorney Docket No. 100.407US02

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR ELECTRONICALLY IDENTIFYING CONNECTIONS  
OF A CROSS-CONNECT SYSTEM

---

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that claims **14-45** are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 502432.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2008-08-05

/Jon M. Powers/  
Jon M. Powers  
Reg. No. 43868

Attorneys for Applicant  
Fogg & Powers LLC  
P.O. Box 581339  
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1339  
T – (612) 332-4720  
F – (612) 332-4731